

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

please ask for: OLWEN HEAP
direct line: 01200 414408
e-mail: olwen.heap@ribblevalley.gov.uk
my ref: OH/CMS
your ref:
date: 8 May 2017

Council Offices
Church Walk
CLITHEROE
Lancashire BB7 2RA

Switchboard: 01200 425111
Fax: 01200 414488

www.ribblevalley.gov.uk

Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the **COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE** is at **6.30pm** on **TUESDAY, 16 MAY 2017** in the **TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET, CLITHEROE.**

I do hope you will be there.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

To: Committee Members (Copy for information to all other members of the Council)
Directors
Press

AGENDA

Part I - items of business to be discussed in public

1. Apologies for absence.
- ✓ 2. Minutes of the meetings held on 14 March 2017 - copy enclosed.
3. Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests (if any).
4. Public participation (if any).

DECISION ITEMS

- ✓ 5. Football Development Proposal including presentation by Clitheroe Wolves – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
6. Appointment of Working Groups: -
 - (a) Grants (4 Members);
 - (b) Car Parking (4 Members);
 - (c) Public Conveniences (4 Members);
 - (d) Open Space (4 Members).

- ✓ 7. Junior Park Run – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 8. Off-Street Parking – Pay by Phone – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- ✓ 9. Report on Outside Bodies – report of Chief Executive – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 10. Capital Outturn 2016/17 – report of Director of Resources – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 11. Meeting with LCC – Waste Management Beyond 2018 – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 12. Preparation for Refuse and Recycling Collection Services from 2018 (report 5) – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 13. Children's Play Areas – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 14. Events on Council Owned Land – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- ✓ 15. General Report – report of Director of Community Services – copy enclosed.
- 16. Reports from Representatives on Outside Bodies (if any).

Part II - items of business **not** to be discussed in public

None

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16th MAY, 2017
title: FOOTBALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: MARK BEVERIDGE

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide information on a proposal from Clitheroe Wolves Football Club (CWFC) to work in partnership with Council to develop a football specific facility at Roefield Playing Pitches. As part of this report, representatives from the Club will attend to give a short presentation to the committee on the project.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – To sustain a strong and prosperous Ribble Valley
- Corporate Priorities - To help make people's lives safer and healthier
- Other Considerations – To develop, with relevant partners, measures to support the visitor economy

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council owns and manages the grass and artificial football pitches at Roefield alongside and behind the Tennis centre, (the centre is operated privately under a lease agreement). These pitches are provided for clubs and groups to hire, for which there are an annual set of charges fixed by Council.

2.2 CWFC is one of the largest football clubs in the Borough running a variety of teams for males and females from juniors through to seniors. This season they have 36 teams, which includes nearly 500 registered young people aged 4-18.

2.3 The club hire facilities from a number of providers due to the number of teams they have to accommodate. These include; Council pitches, Bowland School and the Grammar School. During the winter players travel to Darwen Academy, Blackburn Soccerdome, St Bedes High School Blackburn, Prairie Sports Village and Burnley College to use artificial indoor and outdoor areas. This means that a lot of the teams operate in isolation to the rest of the club geographically, because of the need to play and train throughout the Clitheroe area and further afield.

3 ISSUES

3.1 CWFC has approached this Council with a proposal for a project to develop the football facilities at Roefield playing pitches. This does not require the Council to invest a capital sum in the project, over and above that already committed to annual maintenance. The project would require the Council agreeing to lease some of the land adjacent to the outdoor tennis courts to the Club, so they could apply for planning permission to build an indoor Football Centre incorporating a new artificial 3G pitch area. This would facilitate indoor training during winter months and provide

a year round facility as well for football and rugby teams. The centre would be subject to the normal planning permission process for any building. In addition the current outdoor tennis area would be resurfaced with a 3G artificial surface that would be football specific (3g is the term describing artificial surfaces which have a rubber style infill between the grass filaments, this aligns with the FA National Game Strategy for Participation and Development). Tennis would cease to be offered on this area and only the indoor courts would be available for casual use. There is already a sum in the Council's current capital programme for the lights to be upgraded around the artificial surfaces we have there.

3.2 Funding for this total project, which is expected to be in excess of £1m, would be from the club itself and the Lancaster Foundation.

3.3 At this stage the project is a proposal and details such as charges which the club would pay for a lease, programming and ongoing maintenance liabilities have not been discussed. They would form part of further discussions if Committee approves in principle the idea being proposed in the report for the partnership which CWFC are seeking with the Council for this project. It would if approved and a lease was granted, operate in a similar way to the indoor tennis centre, where the land is leased and the Council receives an annual rent.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – The Council is not currently able to invest in the upgrade to the tennis court surface refurbishment and the proposal for an indoor facility is beyond the scope of the current capital programme. Therefore the provision of external capital offers a tremendous opportunity to enhance the recreational offer for the community in the area, but one which require further exploration to see what the actual implications could be for the Council.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – An agreement would need to be reached with the club on what they would pay for using the facilities if built. The Football Centre development would be subject to the normal planning application process and may not be approved.
- Reputation – The capital investment being proposed from the club is substantial and with low risk for the Council. However, it will be necessary to ensure openness and that any deal is brought before Councillors before an agreement is entered into between the club and the Council on a development.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

5.1 Approves the project in principle and authorises the Director of Community Services to enter into formal negotiations with CWFC regarding the scheme.

5.2 If 5.1 is approved, a report on the agreement be brought to Committee for final consideration.

MARK BEVERIDGE
HEAD OF CULTURAL AND LEISURE SERVICES

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information please ask for Mark Beveridge, extension 4479

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16 MAY 2017
title: JUNIOR PARK RUN
submitted by: JOHN HEAP, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: PETER FLETCHER, SPORTS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide information on an offer from Ribble Valley Runners to gain permission, set up, and establish a Junior Park Run event within the Castle grounds, Clitheroe.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – To improve the opportunity for young people to participate in recreational and sporting activity.
- Corporate Priorities - To help make people's lives safer and healthier, to promote stronger, more confident, and more active communities throughout the borough.
- Other Considerations – To develop, with relevant partners, measures to support the visitor economy (Park Run tourists). To support Sport England and NHS to tackle inactivity.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Park Run is a national charity aimed at getting more people running across the country and the globe. They offer free, safe, timed runs every week in parks around the UK and the world. The runs are normally 5km on Saturday mornings. The nearest local Park Runs for Ribble Valley residents are at Towneley Park, Burnley, or Avenham Park, Preston.

2.2 Junior Park Run follows an identical model, but is exclusively for 4-14yr olds. The junior events are still timed, but cover a junior distance of 2km. The events are free, safe, and easy to take part in. Junior park runs currently operate in 157 locations throughout the UK.

2.3 Ribble Valley Runners is a community group which has as its objective, the interest of the whole running community within Ribble Valley. The group is in the process of being constituted, and anyone with an interest can become a member of the group.

2.4 Ribble Valley, mirroring the national trend, has seen a real surge in running, and running groups, in the area recently.

2.5 The current guideline from the NHS for young people aged 5-18 is 60 minutes of physical activity per day. Running is classed as a vigorous activity.

2.6 A Junior Park Run event would look to be held every Sunday morning at 9am. It would comprise of two laps of a 1km circuit, using the existing tarmac paths within the castle grounds.

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 Park Run, as an organisation, requires that landowners (Ribble Valley Borough Council, in this instance) provide written consent that they are happy for event to be staged on their land every week.
- 3.2 Park Run provides substantial public liability insurance for any runner injured during an event.
- 3.3 Park Run requires that there is an AED (defibrillator) within five minutes of the event. There is a publicly accessible AED located at Trinity Methodist Church.
- 3.4 Park Run requires that there is an established volunteer group to administer events: Ribble Valley Runners is headed up by Dr Jennifer Fairwood (Clitheroe Health Centre), who is passionate about this project, and has recruited a team of event volunteers to help.
- 3.5 Ribble Valley Runners will be required to fund the initial outlay of a Junior Park Run, which is £3000. The group has already explored funding for this, but may approach the Council for a Recreational and Culture grant. This outlay is for IT equipment to monitor runners' registration, and keep track of times.
- 3.6 Clitheroe town centre is quiet on Sunday mornings, so this event will have little impact. Staging the run does not prevent other members of the public from using the Castle Grounds at the same time; the organisers are not seeking, nor require, exclusive use.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The Council is responsible for the maintenance of the parks path, however, the impact of the proposal will be minimal, taking into account the age of the runners.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Council will have to provide written consent to Ribble Valley Runners to formally allow a Junior Park Run to take place.
- Reputation – Granting permission of a Junior Park Run can only be seen as enhancing the reputation of the Council as an organisation that wants to make people's lives safer and healthier, support young people in physical activity, and tackle the nation's problem of inactivity.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

Authorises the Director of Community Services to formally write to Ribble Valley Runners and give them approval to set-up a Junior Park Run within Clitheroe Castle Grounds.

PETER FLETCHER
SPORTS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information, please contact Peter Fletcher 01200 414435

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: TUESDAY 16th MAY 2017
title: OFF STREET PARKING – PAY BY PHONE
submitted by: JOHN HEAP – DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: NEIL YATES – ENGINEERING SERVICES MANAGER

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To look at current issues affecting parking in the borough.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
 - Community Objectives – To sustain a strong and prosperous Ribble Valley.
 - Corporate Priorities – To ensure best use of council resources in the provision of parking.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In March 2016 the Council resolved to implement a Pay by Phone service for all its pay and display car parks on a 12 month trial period. The service was introduced in late April 2016 and is administered by Chipside, our current provider for back office parking services.
- 2.2 The facility enables a vehicle owner to either pre pay for a parking space in a car park where they know there is no mobile signal, or pay for a space by phone if they have no change. Once registered and/or having downloaded the app they can also pay for a reminder text informing them that the time is about to expire, allowing the option to top up so they do not have to rush back and face the prospect of a fine.
- 2.3 Chipside charge 10p per transaction and for any reminder texts that the customer requests. The only charge to the Council is the merchant banking fee which is currently £4.82 excluding VAT per month.
- 2.4 When a virtual ticket is purchased through the scheme a message is sent electronically to the Civil Enforcement Officers to inform them of the purchase, including details of the vehicle that the ticket covers and its expiry time.
- 2.5 Chipside currently provide the back office service for parking enforcement and the Pay by Phone service was available as part of their framework agreement. The Council were therefore able to obtain this service without having to tender the works.

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 Usage of the system over the last 12 months has been reviewed and the following information obtained –

MONTH	No. OF TRANSACTIONS	INCOME	% OF OVERALL PARKING TRANSACTIONS	% OF OVERALL PARKING INCOME
April	3	£6.20	0.01%	0.02%
May	49	£79.50	0.15%	0.22%
June	88	£188.20	0.27%	0.53%
July	126	£243.80	0.40%	0.73%
August	133	£261.60	0.37%	0.64%
September	143	£359.30	0.54%	1.26%
October	131	£344.00	0.40%	0.99%
November	117	£347.30	0.41%	1.14%
December	98	£202.90	0.43%	0.83%
January	108	£285.00	0.42%	1.01%
February	110	£267.60	0.45%	0.99%
March	165	£291.60	0.49%	0.81%
TOTAL	1271	£2,877.00	0.35%	0.74%

- 3.2 After a slow start, the number of transactions steadily increased and whilst usage quietened during the winter months, this was also true of the number of cash transactions made, as reflected in the percentage of overall income column in the table above.
- 3.3 Although usage of the system over the last 12 months has been modest, it is envisaged that this will continue to grow and will be reflected in the income generated in the 2017/18 financial year. However, the aim of the trial was not income generation but to provide the public with another choice of payment.
- 3.4 Electronic payment systems are becoming increasingly commonplace and given that the Council's pay and display machines currently do not have a card payment option, this service offers a viable alternative for many residents and visitors.
- 3.5 The Pay by Phone service is now being offered by the majority of authorities throughout the country and since the Council decided to trial the method, two other Councils in Lancashire have begun to offer the service.
- 3.6 There are minimal problems with the system and has little impact on the performance of the parking enforcement staff.

4 **RISK ASSESSMENTS**

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The scheme is running at a minimal cost to the Council.
- Political – The scheme shows the Council to be moving with the times.
- Reputation – The scheme should only enhance the reputation of the Council.
- Equality & Diversity – The scheme implemented throughout the boroughs' car parks.

5 **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

5.1 Continue with the Pay by Phone Service provided by our present back office parking services provided. To be reconsidered when the back office services contract ends.

NEIL YATES
ENGINEERING SERVICES MANAGER

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information please ask for Neil Yates, extension 4528

REF: Adrian Harper Community Services 25.04.17

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16 May 2017
 title: REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES 2017/18
 submitted by: Chief Executive
 principal author: Olwen Heap

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To inform members of the outside bodies that are under the remit of the Community Services committee and their membership.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities
- Community Objectives – to be a well managed council providing effective services.
 - Corporate Priorities - to protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area; to help make people's lives healthier and safer.
 - Other Considerations – to work in partnership with other bodies in pursuit of the Council's aims and objectives.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At the annual meeting each year the Council makes nominations to various outside bodies.
- 2.2 Members attend meetings of the outside body and report back to the relevant parent committee.

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 The following outside bodies come under the remit of the Community Services committee. The membership of these outside bodies was decided at the annual meeting of the council on 9 May 2017.

Children's Trust	Cllr Stella Brunskill
Lancashire Tourism Forum	Cllr Joyce Holgate
Lancashire Waste Partnership	Cllr Ian Sayers
Langho Football Club	Cllr Alison Brown
Longridge Social Enterprise Company Ltd	Cllr Ken Hind
RV Sports & Recreation Association (Roefield Leisure Centre)	Cllr Graham Geldard Cllr Noel Walsh
Salesbury & Copster Green Commons Management Committee	Cllrs Peter Ainsworth, Sue Bibby and Stuart Hirst

- 3.2 There is a standard item on all agendas for members on outside bodies to report back to the parent committee.

3.3 Representatives are encouraged to provide reports back giving committee an update on the work of the body and drawing attention to any current issues.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – the costs associated with members attending meetings of outside bodies is included in the budget for 2017/18.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – no significant risks identified
- Political - no significant risks identified
- Reputation – no significant risks identified
- Equality & Diversity - no significant risks identified

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Members note the outside bodies under the remit of this committee and their membership.

Marshal Scott
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Olwen Heap
ADMINISTRATION OFFICER

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Report on Representatives on Outside Bodies – Annual Council 9.5.17

REF: CE/OMH/COM/16.5.17

For further information please ask for Olwen Heap, extension 4408

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 10

meeting date: 16 MAY 2017
 title: CAPITAL OUTTURN 2016/17
 submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES
 principal author: ANDREW COOK

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to review the final outturn of the 2016/17 capital programme for Community Services Committee and to seek member approval for the slippage of some capital scheme budgets from the 2016/17 financial year to the 2017/18 financial year.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
- Community Objectives – none identified.
 - Corporate Priorities - to continue to be a well-managed council providing efficient services based on identified customer need.
 - Other Considerations – none identified.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The original capital programme for this Committee, approved in March 2016, consisted of six schemes with an original estimated cost of £374,500.
- 2.2 In November 2016 the Emergency Committee provided additional approval for the Ribblesdale Pool Improvement Work scheme budget to be increased by £68,425, as a result of changes to the scheme.
- 2.3 The revised capital programme budget of £440,955 was then approved by this Committee in January 2017, following a review of progress on each of the six schemes.
- 2.4 During the financial year this Committee has received reports monitoring the progress of schemes within the programme.
- 2.5 As part of the closure of accounts process, capital programme expenditure has been capitalised and added to the balance sheet or charged to revenue where appropriate.

3 CAPITAL OUTTURN 2016/17

- 3.1 The table below summarises the final outturn position on the capital schemes for this Committee. It shows budget approvals, actual expenditure in-year and requested slippage into 2017/18.

Original Estimate 2016/17 £	Additional Approvals 2016/17 £	Total Approved Budget 2016/17 £	Revised Estimate 2016/17 £	Actual Expenditure 2016/17 £	Requested slippage into 2017/18 £
374,500	68,425	442,925	440,955	416,094	23,600

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16th MAY, 2017
title: MEETING WITH LANCASHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
- WASTE MANAGEMENT BEYOND 2018
Author and submitted by: JOHN HEAP, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To report to committee on a meeting with Lancashire County Council's Director of Community Services, and the Head of Service (Waste Management) that took place on 4 April 2017.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
- Council Ambitions - none
 - Community Objectives – To increase the recycling of waste material
 - Corporate Priorities - To be a well-managed Council, providing efficient services based on identified customer needs.
 - Other Considerations – To protect and enhance the environmental quality of our area.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Lancashire County Council (LCC) have advised the 12 district councils that are the Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs) that the current funding arrangements that support recycling services will be withdrawn from April 2018.
- 2.2 The existing arrangements – commonly known as Cost Sharing – were created to replace statutory payments of recycling credits to WCAs by LCC as the Waste Disposal Authority (WDA).
- 2.3 Recycling Credits were created by statute when the government recognised that, in order to help residents to recycle more waste, collection systems must become more elaborate (and costly for WCAs) than previously.
- 2.4 At the same time, government recognised that improved performance in recycling leads to a reduction in waste going to landfill, with commensurate savings for WDAs.
- 2.5 Committee will be familiar with the impact on this authority that we anticipate when the WDA withdraws funding next April. For Ribble Valley, the annual loss is anticipated to be £430,000.
- 2.6 In order to be ready to mitigate that loss by identifying measures that might deliver savings, committee has considered a series of topic reports since August last year.
- 2.7 Whilst the other districts in Lancashire have not followed the same process exactly, the concerns that we feel are shared, and in other districts the sums of money involved are significantly greater.

- 2.8 Consequently, at the meeting of the Lancashire Waste Management Partnership, held on 26 October 2016, the districts submitted an agreed series of questions of common concern for consideration by LCC (Appendix A). It was requested that a response be given to each WCA within 3 weeks.
- 2.9 After some weeks' delay, it was explained to the District Waste Management Officers that LCC officers felt it more appropriate to meet with each District individually. Subsequently, invitations were sent out to each District's Chief Executive, inviting him/her to meet with LCC's Director of Community Services.

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 After a discussion in a meeting of the Corporate Management Team, it was agreed that it would be more appropriate for the Director of Community Services to attend the meeting on behalf of the Council, rather than the Chief Executive.
- 3.2 Consequently, I wrote to make arrangements to meet Phil Barrett, LCC's Director of Community Services, on 13 March 2017.
- 3.3 In my request for the meeting, I included the following:

'In addition to the questions as agreed between the Districts, I would like to discuss the particular circumstances around the Waste Transfer facility constructed on our depot site at Salthill. No formal contract has ever been entered into between our respective councils and, in light of a number of changes to the circumstances surrounding the agreement that have been introduced – unilaterally – by the County Council, the provisions of the agreed Heads of Terms, clearly, are no longer applicable. At a meeting of this Council's Community Services Committee last night, I was asked by committee to pursue with LCC the question of whether we are to mothball the facility (and what service will be provided in its place) or, alternatively, to pass back to the County Council responsibility for the operation of the facility, as this is really a waste disposal function.'

Given that RVBC stands to lose £430,000 from its annual income from next April – representing almost 33% of our net expenditure on refuse collection, recycling, and waste transfer – committee is in the middle of a comprehensive review of our operations with a clear objective of bridging that funding gap from April next year by taking some harsh decisions around redesigned/reduced services. I do hope that, by answering the shared concerns that were raised by Waste Officers last October, the County Council will provide a clearer picture of how you see your obligations as Disposal Authority being met from next year.'

- 3.4 I met with Phil Barrett and with LCC's Head of Service (Waste Management), Steve Scott, at County Hall, on 4 April 2017 for approximately one hour.
- 3.5 Rather than going through the questions compiled by Waste Management Officers, LCC's representatives preferred to discuss – in broader terms – the challenges we face in Ribble Valley from next year. Below is a summary of topics covered:
- LCC have no funds available ('no cash in the pot')
 - LCC are looking to introduce major changes in 2025 (end of the current landfill contract)
 - LCC are looking at Energy From Waste for the future (either 1 x 300kT plant, or 3 x 100kT plants if contingency provision is needed)
 - They were interested in RVBC's options considered so far, and:
 - urged that RVBC should charge for green waste, and
 - queried why RVBC does not just reduce frequency of collection
 - LCC view the major opportunity lying in a restructure of the service across the county

- Having met individual districts, LCC understand now that one size doesn't fit all
- LCC have a problem with the (recyclate) markets – only paper and card has any value, and they have to pay gate fees for the rest
- LCC has to find £120m savings – there is nothing in the pot
- There will be no payments made to districts after next April
- There is no room for a change in direction if the administration changes in May – there is no cash
- LCC will include RVBC in their thinking for any new arrangements in East Lancashire (it appeared that no account had been taken in their planning of our ceasing the operation of the Transfer Station)

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – None arising directly from this report, although it is known that the Council will lose £430,000 annual income from next April.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None arising as a direct result of this report.
- Political – None at the time of writing
- Reputation – None at the time of writing

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 Although the questions posed by Waste Management Officers were not addressed specifically, the impression given was that LCC expect their arrangement with RVBC to continue in its present form – but without payments being made.
- 5.2 Indeed, the WDA would prefer further segregation of waste, with food waste being collected separately, and it was noted that those authorities that have moved on to three-weekly collections have been able to introduce this service.
- 5.3 It was made very clear that the financial problems that LCC are facing are driving their policies in relation to waste management. However, it was not clear whether LCC have evaluated fully the possible effects of their decisions. (For example, the cessation of funding WCAs removes the ability to punish contamination of the recyclate. With no incentive to ensure low levels of contamination, WCAs might opt to reduce their own monitoring/enforcement in order to generate savings. Over time, this might be expected to lead to poor quality recyclate, more rejections by the markets, and increased disposal costs.)
- 5.4 LCC are aware that Committee is in the process of considering a suite of reports on various aspects of our refuse collection and recycling services. They have been advised that it is the intention of Committee to use these reports to inform a debate in preparation for the 2018/19 budget process, beginning in the autumn of this year, most likely at your August meeting. At that time, committee should be in a position to take a decision as to which measures might be introduced to mitigate the loss of funding of £430,000 pa for recycling.

JOHN C HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information, please contact John Heap 01200 414461

Community Services Committee 16.5.17 / JCH / IW

Questions tabled to LCC from the WCAs at the Lancashire Waste Management Meeting Wednesday 26th October 2016

With the withdrawal of Cost Sharing payment from April 2018 it is the WCAs understanding that this will apply to all the terms and conditions of the agreement. At that time the WCAs will look to introduce the least cost option in dealing with waste and recycling collections. To avoid confusion WCAs request LCC supply answers to the following 12 questions.

1. What are the options/arrangements being proposed by LCC for each WCA's waste (please detail all waste streams i.e. residual, recycling, garden waste etc.) pre and post CSA ending in April 2018? WCAs wish to know (1) if/where they will be directed to tip each waste stream, (2) what transport services will be provided (if any) and (3) operating days/hours of each site/facility.
2. To avoid confusion, can LCC advise each district which waste streams LCC will be directing WCAs to deliver e.g. kerbside, bring sites, bulkies, commercial waste, scrap skips etc. and clarify whether WCAs will be allowed to retain any of this waste to deal with themselves?
3. If LCC wish WCAs to retain certain/any household recycling waste, what is the value of the recycling credit that will be paid to WCAs from April 2018?
4. Will there be a garden waste gate fee payable if LCC wish to deal with the processing of garden waste and what is the value of this and the recycling credit to be paid if so?
5. For those WCAs that have a depot to bulk up recycling/residual waste, will LCC (if directing WCAs to deliver waste to their facilities) expect to utilise the depot and if so what payment will LCC make to WCAs for the use of such facility?
6. Does LCC intend to issue Powers of Direction to WCAs? If so, for which waste(s) and when?
7. After Cost Sharing ends, will there be any income sharing with WCAs from the sale of recycle?
8. Will LCC make any incentives payments to WCAs for reducing/preventing residual waste going to landfill/disposal, and/or reducing/preventing recycling/garden waste going for landfill/disposal after 1st April 2018?
9. Will LCC make any incentive payments to WCAs for maintaining/lowering contamination of mixed dry recycling when/if WCAs have to deliver this material to LCC after 1st April 2018?
10. Will LCC make any incentive payments to WCAs for maintaining the limit on residual waste to 280Lts per fortnight and any enforcement activities?
11. WCAs would like to request a detailed breakdown and justification of the Trade Waste disposal charge, in particular the admin charge and costs associated with any material going through a waste processing facility.

12. WCAs request a fundamental review of tipping away payments.

WCAs request LCC to provide a written 'open' response to each WCA on all questions within 3 weeks. If responses are not provided these questions will be tabled again at the LWP by (District members) on the 24th November 2016.

ORIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16 MAY 2017
title: PREPARATION FOR REFUSE AND RECYCLING COLLECTION SERVICES
FROM 2018 (REPORT 5)
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: PETER McGEORGE

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To inform Members of the implications for the current refuse and recycling collection services following the withdrawal by Lancashire County Council of Cost Sharing payments from April 2018,
- 1.2 To present Members with options focussing on making alternative arrangements for the recycling of all our recyclable and compostable waste streams.
- 1.3 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
 - Community Objectives – To increase the recycling of waste material.
 - Corporate Priorities – To be a well managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer needs.
 - Other Considerations – To protect and enhance the environmental quality of our area.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This report is the fifth of a number of preliminary reports that are being presented to this Committee up until August 2017. Each report focusses on one of a range of options available to this authority that may in part, help mitigate the budget shortfall of £430,340 per annum,(based on current service provision), as a result of the withdrawal of the Cost Sharing agreement by Lancashire County Council from April 2018.
- 2.2 A summary of each of the proposed preliminary reports already presented to this Committee are outlined below:
- 2.3 Charging for garden waste collections (Report 1 – 23 August 2016) considered the impact of the introduction of a charge for the collection of garden waste. It outlined the issues around the collection of garden waste including a survey of other authorities of a similar rural nature who had already introduced a subscription based garden waste collection service for residents. Although it was demonstrated that the introduction of charges for garden waste would be unlikely to address fully the financial shortfall arising with the withdrawal of Cost sharing payments in 2018, it did indicate that this was one measure that could help bridge the funding gap if required. The report concluded that it was most likely that a package of measures would be required to address the financial problem that would enable a reasonable level of service to be retained for residents.

- 2.4 Options for dealing with mixed paper and cardboard (Report 2 – 11 October 2016) provided a brief outline of a number of options for dealing with mixed paper and cardboard that may offer savings or generate income for this authority. Members were also advised that even at these preliminary stages there are risks and uncertainties which may affect the decisions to be made by Committee in due course. The report also explained the background behind the current arrangements for dealing with mixed paper and cardboard under the Cost Sharing agreement and the claim of exclusivity by the County Council for this material. The report covered the Council's regulatory responsibilities for the segregation and recycling of all dry recyclable materials which includes paper and cardboard. The report concluded that even if Committee were minded to abandon this separate service, the savings would not independently address the deficit created by the withdrawal of Cost Sharing payments in 2018, but it did demonstrate that it might contribute to the savings required.
- 2.5 Changes to refuse collection frequency and/or changes to recycling collection frequencies (Report 3 – 10 January 2017) outlined options available for changes to refuse collection frequency and /or changes to recycling collection frequencies. The report did not examine in detail the model of each change in frequency option that could be applied to the refuse and recycling collection service but gave an overview of the most likely operational implications such changes would present. It also highlighted that adopting many of the models for change in frequency of collection may require significant capital investment to replace the collection vehicle fleet and/or to provide householders with larger wheeled bins and/or additional containers. The report concluded that the implications of changing the frequency of collection are complex as many would require significant capital investment, overall financial benefits would not be immediately evident; however the report did seek to demonstrate that a contribution to the savings might be found from this area.
- 2.6 Mothballing of the Waste Transfer Station (Report 4 – 14 March 2017) outlined options with regard to mothballing of the waste transfer station or alternatively passing back the responsibility to the County Council to operate the facility as ultimately this is a waste disposal function. It explained the difficulties acquiring the information necessary to provide Members with sufficient guidance as to the savings the mothballing of the waste transfer station may generate. It explained that the Director of Community Services was to meet with the County Council to seek information on their future plans that might clarify future responsibilities and arrangements for dealing with collected waste streams. The meeting has taken place with a separate report included within this agenda.
- 2.7 Prior to the development of the County Waste Technology Parks, districts determined their individual recycling collection arrangements and sourced outlets/ markets for the collected material. Additionally districts were entitled to claim statutory recycling credits from the waste disposal authority. (As reported previously to this Committee, Lancashire County Council offered Cost Sharing payments as an alternative to recycling credits to which we have recently entered into the agreement)
- 2.8 By working in partnership with the County Council it was considered unnecessary to impose statutory powers to make the long term arrangements for introducing sustainable waste management as set out in the Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Lancashire. This unfortunately has allowed the County Council to subsequently withdraw their financial support through Cost Sharing for the costs incurred by districts in providing segregated collection systems. Legal Counsel was sought on whether we could challenge the County Council decision but there was no guarantee of success if we took the matter to court.

2.9 Whilst the County Council continue to operate the Material Recycling Facility within the Farington Waste Technology Park, they are continuing to claim exclusivity for all our waste streams.

3 Options for dealing with our recyclable / compostable waste streams

3.1 As with the previous report there are currently many unanswered questions to which the answers are critical to the decision making process. As explained in Report 4, District officers tabled a list of questions to the County Council in October seeking information on their future plans for the mothballed Waste Technology facilities and whether any incentives will be offered to districts in continuing with current arrangements. Those and other relevant questions remain unanswered due to the Director of Community Services for Lancashire County Council suggesting that there was little to be gained from providing a county wide response but writing to all district Chief Executives offering to meet with individual districts to discuss the future arrangements for the transfer and transport of waste at a strategic level. In order to consider a bespoke list of questions for this meeting we needed to consider whether the Heads of Terms for the Waste Transfer Station are still valid as a result of the decisions by the County Council to terminate their PFI waste contract and the mothballing of the of the PFI waste facilities. It is suggested that legal opinion is therefore also required to determine our position due to the changes being made by the County Council and on the issue of exclusivity for all our segregated waste streams.

3.2 Members are also reminded that this authority sought guidance from the Secretary of State following the decision by the County Council to withdraw payment of recycling credits. The Secretary of State considered it unreasonable for the County Council to expect the district collection authorities to stand the cost of providing segregated collection systems, whilst they profited from the sale of the collected recyclable materials.

3.3 It is unclear whether the Material Recycling Facility (MRF) will remain operational in the long term as the County Council explore their options for treatment of waste in Lancashire. Market forces may also influence their decision on the future of the MRF as the materials saleable value reduces. As explained earlier in the report it has been difficult for your officers to gather the information from the County Council to assist with our planning post April 2018 and to provide accurate financial information on each of the options.

3.4 There are a number of options for dealing with the recyclable / compostable waste streams we recover, each with significant risks and rewards, which are covered below:

- a) Cease the separate collection of paper and cardboard, and collect in the burgundy wheeled bin.

This was one of the options for dealing with this material in Report 2, 11 October 2016. Whilst it demonstrated that it would contribute to the savings required, the report did explain that we would need to undertake TEEP assessment. It is also worth noting that the County Council would lose the income from the sale of the material and also at current rates would need to find an additional £243k to pay for its disposal. Officers are uncertain what steps the County Council would or could take if Members chose this option.

It is also worth noting that such a move would be unpopular with our residents who have keenly supported this service and would have a significant impact on our recycling performance rate.

- b) Add paper and cardboard in with the current co-mingled waste stream and pass on to the County Council to sort.

No incentives have been offered by the County council to sustain / improve levels of contamination, and any reduction in quality of material would result in lower saleable value and probably increase their disposal costs. Furthermore, the County Council has advised that the MRF at Farington was only designed to separate glass, cans and plastic bottles and would therefore be unable to deal with the addition of paper and cardboard. It is most likely that they would object to this option although we could argue that they should source a direct market for the full co-mingled waste stream. The potential savings for this option are much the same as those explained in option a.

- c) Add paper and cardboard in with the current co-mingled waste stream and source directly a market for fully co-mingled waste stream.

There are markets although limited in number, that accept fully co-mingled dry recyclable materials, although the saleable value is much lower as a result. It is most likely that the County Council would object to this move as they consider they have exclusivity rights to all our waste and also would lose the income from the sale of the recyclable material. This option offers one the greatest benefits to Ribble Valley as we could make savings from the paper and cardboard collections, make statutory recycling credit claims and gain income from the sale of the material although this is subject to market fluctuations. Any benefits would be offset by the costs of bulk hauling the material to the market / outlet.

- d) Stop providing all the collected dry recyclate (incl. separately collected paper and cardboard, co-mingled glass, cans and plastic) and garden waste to the County Council and source our own markets / outlets.

As in option c above it is most likely that the County Council would object to this move as they consider they have exclusivity rights to all our waste and also would lose the income from the sale of the recyclable material. This option again offers one the greatest benefits to Ribble Valley as we would be entitled to claim statutory recycling credit and income from the sale of the material would be much better due to the improvement in quality although this is subject to market fluctuations. As also above, any benefits would be offset by the costs of bulk hauling the material to the market / outlet.

- e) Change frequency of collection.

This option has been covered in Report 3, and can be applied to options a, b, c and d, however the implications of changing frequency are complex and the potential financial benefits would also be offset by the significant capital investment required.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – None at this stage although the driver for this review is the loss of £430,340 annual income from 2018. It is currently difficult to evaluate the full resource implications until all the information has been acquired. Taking responsibility for the sourcing of material markets / outlets will require bulk haulage arrangements to be made from the council's waste transfer station, which on a positive note officers have previously organised.

Technical, Environmental and Legal – There is no certainty of success should the Council decide to legally challenge the County Council's claim for exclusivity for all our collected waste streams. We are not aware of any precedent set by the courts on similar disputes. Additionally we cannot anticipate the response or changes that may be introduced by the County Council as a result. The risk of market fluctuations would affect whichever authority is responsible for sourcing the markets however any income would be of benefit to this authority as we currently do not receive any compensation other than Cost sharing payment. Income from statutory recycling credit payments would realise more than the loss from Cost Sharing (assumed to be in the region of £55.93 pt x – 8033 tonnes per annum = £449k)

- Political – None at this stage.
- Reputation – None at this stage although any negative impacts as a result would not be welcomed or popular and may generate negative reaction from residents.
- Equality & Diversity – eg No implications identified.

5 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 Without further information it is difficult to establish our legal position on several of the options covered within this report and also the extent of the savings and or income that each option may generate.
- 5.2 This is the final preliminary report of a number of reports presented to Committee exploring a range of options available to this authority that may in part help mitigate the budget shortfall due to the withdrawal of the Cost Sharing Agreement. At the next meeting of this Committee on 29 August 2017, Members will be requested to determine what measures from the range of options provided to introduce, so that costs/income can be calculated as we prepare the Council's budget for 2018/19.

PETER McGEORGE
WASTE MANAGEMENT OFFICER

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Preparation for Refuse and Recycling Collection Services from 2018 (Report Number 4) – 14 March 2017

Preparation for Refuse and Recycling Collection Services from 2018 (Report Number 3) – 10 January 2017

Preparation for Refuse and Recycling Collection Services from 2018 (Report Number 2) – 11 October 2016

Preparation for Refuse and Recycling Collection Services from 2018 – 23 August 2016

Options following the withdrawal of recycling credits – 13 January 2016

Minute 495

WRAP - A framework for Greater Consistency in Household Recycling in England

Waste Management Files

Waste Transfer Station (WTS) Salthill Depot, Clitheroe – 12 July 2005

Waste Transfer Station (WTS) Salthill Depot, Clitheroe – 11 January 2005

For further information please ask for Peter McGeorge, extension 4467.

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16th MAY, 2017
title: CHILDREN'S PLAY AREAS
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: MARK BEVERIDGE

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To provide information on the scale and range of play areas in the Borough, which the Council operates.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities
- Community Objectives – To sustain a strong and prosperous Ribble Valley
 - Corporate Priorities - To help makes people's lives safer and healthier
 - Other Considerations – To develop, with relevant partners, measures to support the visitor economy

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Council operates 18 play areas across the Borough; these are listed in the appendix. This list also includes play areas which are in the Borough and accessible by the community. There are a number of schools which have play facilities these are specific to the school and not included in this list.
- 2.2 The Council does not manage or provide every play area in the Ribble Valley, there are a number provided by Town and Parish Councils, as well as some which have been incorporated into new housing developments which are the responsibility of the individual developer.
- 2.3 Children's Play is enshrined in the United Nations Article 31 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. As such it is seen as integral to their development and play areas provide opportunities for children to act spontaneously and in an unstructured way.
- 2.4 The play areas the Council provides range in size and space from the largest such as the one in the Castle grounds to the smallest which is Whalley Calderstones, with 3 pieces of equipment.
- 2.5 The annual budget for the 18 play areas is £40k; this sum covers all expenditure relating to their upkeep, including inspection/maintenance, equipment replacement and enhancement.

3 ISSUES

- 3.1 Misuse and vandalism of play areas constitute a significant portion of the annual budget. Due to the unpredictability of the damage that results from vandalism and misuse, it is very difficult to predict what the annual cost will be across the 18 play areas. Some such as Salthill are predictable because it is out of the way and often

subject to anti-social behaviour, despite attempts by Council staff and the Police to minimise it. Others such as Castle or Mardale might happen when the clocks go back and damage is perpetrated under the cover of darkness.

- 3.2 Depending upon the state of the budget, one of the play areas may be chosen to be enhanced annually if possible. This has taken the form of introducing an additional piece of equipment or introducing traditional school yard games onto tarmac areas. However with safety surfaces costing up to £90 per metre and small items of equipment costing around £400, with the larger pieces being as much as £3,000, the budget does not allow for many brand new additional items of equipment being installed.
- 3.3 It is planned to assess the current 18 play areas and determine if they are all required, in light of other play provision which might now be provided. If rationalisation of the 18 is a potential then a further report will be brought back to this committee. Until that time the Council will continue to maintain and operate the 18 areas within the budget provided.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – The capital budget used for the play areas is subject to an annual bid as part of the Council's capital programme.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – Maintenance of the play areas is essential, Council staff carry out regular inspections which is supplemented by an annual inspection from the Council's insurer. The information from both forms the basis for maintenance work which is carried out on the equipment, safety surfaces, gates and fences.
- Reputation – The general public enjoy using our play areas, but they compare our offer with that of other areas they see, which can raise expectation beyond our ability to fulfil.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

Committee note the report.

MARK BEVERIDGE
HEAD OF CULTURAL AND LEISURE SERVICES

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information please ask for Mark Beveridge, extension 4479

APPENDIX

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Edisford Play Area	Edisford Road BB7 3LA	Council	4 x Swings-(Older age) Medium sized play unit
Henthorn Play Area	Henthorn Road BB7 2QB	Council	2x 2 sets of swings Slide- large Climbing Unit Wood balance unit at low level
Salthill Playground	Salthill Road BB7 1PE	Council	0-5 yr child's unit Small climbing frame Climbing/slide for older children Balancing wood beam
Castle Grounds	Eshton Terrace, Clitheroe BB7 1BA	Council	Wide range of equipment for all ages- 12 swings and 22 items in total
Hurst Green	Avenue Road BB7 9QB	Parish Council	Swings x 4 (young to older) Slide with twist Imaginative/Learning Section
John Smiths	Chaigley Road Longridge PR3 3TQ	RVBC	2x Play and slide units for early ages and older Low balance equipment See-Saw Rocking Equipment x 2

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Kestor Lane Junior Play	Kestor Lane Recreation Ground PR3 3LD	RVBC	5 swings 1 Play unit – small 1 play unit – large 1 see saw
Kestor Lane	As above	Longridge Town Council	Zip line Rota play High climb unit 3 x
Mardale Rd	Mardale Rd Longridge PR3	RVBC	4 x swings 1 play unit
Redwood Drive	Redwood Drive PR3 3HA	RVBC	2 swings (early) 2 swings (older) Small Unit + Slide
Chester Avenue Tom Robinson Play Area	BB7 2AJ	Clitheroe Town Council	2 X2 Swings 4 items of balance rocker play
Mearley Sykes	BB7 1JG	RVBC	Swings x 2 See-saw (spring) Slide and climbing unit

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Proctor's Field, Whalley	George St	RVBC	Variety of equipment to suit ages up to 12 years and challenging aspects of play
Langho	BB7 9NA	Parish/Other	Equipment area designed for up to 12 years. Unit with climbing frame
Mellor Brook	Fieldings Lane	Parish/Other	2 items of equipment- 1 x Toddler swing and 1 slide for young children
Mellor	St Mary's Garden's Mellor BB7 2JP	Parish	Low level balance/ continuous run crawl section, 2 person see-saw. 2x swings 1 x Rocker for Toddlers
Highfield Road Clitheroe	BB7 1LD	RVBC	Swings x 4 Young children's climbing frame and older aged unit. Rota Play unit Low level balance continuous play unit.
Colthirst Drive, Clitheroe	BB7 2EJ	RVBC	1 Pair swings for under 5's 1 climbing unit with slide 1 x balance rocker

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Hawthorn Place, Clitheroe	BB7 2HU	RVBC	3 items in total 2 x 2 swings 1 play unit for under 8's.
Barrow	Washbrook Close	RVBC	2 x 2 Swings See/Saw Climbing Unit and slide 1 x Rocker 1x Rota Play
Dunsop Bridge	BB7 3BB	Parish	Large Wooden Area with swings Play Units and low level balance Fitness Trail Youth Shelter, Skate Park and Climbing Wall
Chatburn	BB7 4AS	Parish	2 Play Units for children of younger and slightly older ages-up to 12 years. 2x swings –Toddler Round-about, Balance Rocker
Rimington	BB74AS	Parish	Top section- Older child play unit with balance/ climb and slide sections 2x 2 swings younger and older ages. See Saw. Seated Round a bout. Wooden balance unit
Gisburn	BB7 4ET Burnley Rd.	Parish	Smaller child's equipment on lower section. Swings x2. Challenging wooden adventure play section and upper level Zip wire over distance of approx 20 m.

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Waddington	BB7 3LF	Parish	4X Swings 2 Toddler and 2 Over 5's Climbing units- with climbing and slides. Balance low level unit with ropes.
West Bradford	BB7 4T	Parish	4X Swings 2 Toddler and 2 Over 5's Climbing frame with various types of climbing. Tunnel (3 sections) 1 X Round about Under 5's area 2x Rockers
Grindleton	BB7 4QS	Parish	Continuous balance play- wood based equipment at low level Junior Under 5's unit with slide. 2x2 sets of swings for under and over 5's. Older age climbing unit of reasonable size
Slaidburn	Village Green BB7 3ES	Parish	Wooden Fitness/ Trim Trail No children's play equipment
Sawley	BB7 4LE	Parish	Good variety to suit up to 12 years. 2x climbing units 2x2 swings Wooden balance play section- continuous play
Woodlands	Whalley	RVBC	Equipment for up to 5yrs. 3 items including balance rocker, swings and small play unit.

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Billington	Whalley Rd	Parish	Wooden climbing unit in the design of a castle. Swings and also a circular type swing. Low-level balance continuous play made from wood. Educational orientated play equipment x4 Climbing Wall.
Wilpshire	Durham Road	Council	2 x Balance Rockers Slide to suit ages up to 12 years. 2 x 2 sets of swings for younger and older children
Read	Whalley Road BB12 7PE	Parish	Play Unit which has disability suitable slide. Climbing Ladder, Balance Rockers x2 6 items of exercise equipment. 2 x2 swings Play unit for younger children.
Sabden	The Holme Recreation Ground	Parish	2x2 sets of swings for older/ younger ages. 3x Balance Rockers, small play unit-slides and climbing. Larger-child's slide, continuous play- low balance, Climbing structure-roped unit, Rocket shaped see-saw, 2x Parallel bars for dips
Chipping	Chipping Village Hall	Parish	Small Wooden climbing frame. 2 x s sets of swings for different age ranges. 1 x play unit for under 12's and 1 junior / infant. Continuous low level balance equipment.
Low Moor	St Anne's Court BB7 2NN	Council	2 X Toddler aged swings 2 x Older child swings Small climbing/ slide unit which is disability friendly. 1x See Saw, 2 x Rockers for young children

Venue Name	Address – If known	Provider (Council/Private/Parish)	Overview of Equipment
Whalley-Calderstones	Pendle Drive BB7 9RH	Parish/Other	3 items of equipment for toddlers;- 2 rockers and 1 very small slide. (LAP-Toddler/ Doorstep play)
Whalley- Calderstones Whalley Moor-WOODLANDS	Off Beach Drive	Council	2x Swings High Level sit on see-saw equipment for older ages. Balance trail including 'cargo' type climbing netting. Covered sheltered 'Hammock' type area. Unit combining slide, climbing, in a woodland themed design.
Ribchester	Off Church Street Ribchester PR3 3YE	Parish	Sand Pit and wooden play, Large and smaller slides, mixed aged swings, climbing apparatus-cargo net Picnic tables x 2 and 4 benches
Park Street-Clitheroe	Park Street/ Littlemoor View	Clitheroe Town Council	2x Swings (Toddler) and 2x swings child. 1x small slide Wooden balance play area in a circuit. Grass playing space

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16th MAY, 2017
title: EVENTS ON COUNCIL-OWNED LAND
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal author: MARK BEVERIDGE

1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide information on the scale and range of events on Council owned land.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – To sustain a strong and prosperous Ribble Valley
- Corporate Priorities - To encourage economic development throughout the borough, with specific focus on tourism
- Other Considerations – To develop, with relevant partners, measures to support the visitor economy

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Council owns a number of locations where events are staged. The most popular outdoor sites are Kestor Lane recreation ground in Longridge and the Castle Grounds in Clitheroe. The others being the car park at Edisford and Ribblesdale Pool.

2.2 The events for the current year are listed in the appendix to this report.

3 ISSUES

3.1 The primary issue is the impact any event will have on either the users of the area, e.g. Castle Grounds or the residents in the surrounding areas.

3.2 When events are staged, the Council asks in most instances, for a refundable deposit to be paid up front, which is returned or not, depending upon the state of the ground after the event has been staged.

3.3 Not all events are granted permission, for some it is because the ground conditions for a grass area are not suitable early in the year. They may not be suitable in the summer either, depending upon the weather, in which case a discussion with the event organiser would be arranged and the event might be called off.

3.4 Where events have traditionally been held e.g. the fair at Edisford car park, other factors now come into play. Ribblesdale Pool, Roefield Sports Centre, the tennis centre and the artificial pitches all place their own demands on the available parking spaces for example, which was not the case in the past when the fair was staged. This makes parking on the days when the fair is staged more difficult in the area.

3.5 The Council does not run many of its own events, the majority are a result of other people or organisations wishing to host something be that for profit or charity. Events can provide opportunities for local residents to participate in a community activity, e.g. Longridge Field Day or assist in economic development, such as the Tour of Britain. Overall they add to the cultural fabric of the Borough.

3.6 There are many more events which are staged around the Borough, e.g. Beat Herders, Chipping Steam Fair, which have little or no Council support, yet have established themselves and thrive in their chosen area. It is encouraging that people are willing to put in the time and effort necessary for these to be successful as they help in no small part to the cultural offer in the Borough for residents and visitors alike.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – Most events pay the rate applicable for the space being occupied. Some pay less and a few pay nothing.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – All events are required to apply for permission to stage their event and are issued a contract to sign. Depending upon the scale of the event they might be asked to present their plans to the Ribble Valley Safety Advisory Group. This comprises ourselves, LCC and the emergency services, the members of which can then ask questions of the organisers to ensure the plans being proposed are robust and have taken account of the various safety issues that might apply.
- Reputation – A single event can result in a positive or negative response from all sorts of directions. The Council's primary function is to provide a range of services and events is not one which has specific priority. Yet some local residents will also feel that the Council ought to help facilitate events on the land it owns for people to attend or participate in.

5 **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

Committee note the report.

MARK BEVERIDGE
HEAD OF CULTURAL AND LEISURE SERVICES

JOHN HEAP
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information please ask for Mark Beveridge, extension 4479

APPENDIX

19 March 2017	-	Amelia Cup Fun Run	Castle Grounds
23-26 March 2017	-	J W Shaw Funfair	Edisford CP
16 April 2017	-	Triathlon (No other booking for Roefield/Edisford)	Pool/Edisford CP
29 April 2017	-	Busk Vinyl	Market
30 Apr - 1 May 17	-	Jazz & Blues Festival NOT USING BANDSTAND THIS YEAR	
7 May 2017	-	Wolves Presentation Day	Roefield
9 May 2017	-	Orienteering	Castle Grounds/Field
11 June 2017	-	Longridge Field Day & Funfair (8, 9 & 10)	Kestor Lane
18 June 2017	-	Crossroads Bed Race Event CANCELLED	Castle Grounds
24 June 2017	-	Christian Churches BBQ	Castle Field
25 June 2017	-	Civic Sunday (Mayor)	
16 July 2017	-	Sunday Band Concert	Bandstand
5 August 2017	-	Last Night of the Proms	Bandstand
19 August 2017	-	Beats Cancer Music Festival	Castle Grounds
19-22 Oct 2017	-	J W Shaw Funfair	Edisford CP
9 Dec 2017	-	Santa Dash	Castle Grounds/Field

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16 May 2017
title: GENERAL REPORT
submitted by: JOHN HEAP, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
principal authors: MARK BEVERIDGE, HEAD OF CULTURAL AND LEISURE SERVICES
TOM PRIDMORE, TOURISM AND EVENTS OFFICER

1 PURPOSE

To update on events and developments within Community Services.

2 CYCLE RACE

A proposal has been made by Lancaster City Council to stage a mass participation cycle race next year. If this happens, it would include some of the roads in the Borough, because they are seeking a route which starts and finishes in Lancaster, riding out to include the Ribble Valley. It could have an economic benefit for the area during the weekend that it was staged, with riders and families seeking accommodation, though potentially also bringing some disruption to the area depending upon the size of the entry. Further details are being sought to determine with what, if anything, the Council would be involved.

3 CLITHEROE FOOD FESTIVAL

Preparations for the Clitheroe Food Festival continue in collaboration with the Food Festival Company. The website will be revamped using a new template and launched as soon as possible. This will promote the festival and sell demonstration tickets.

The number of stalls this year will be a similar number to 2016, with producers wanting to return to one of the Top 10 Food Festivals in the country. The number seeking stalls exceeds the space available, providing the opportunity to ensure the quality standards are maintained. A number of new attractions are being developed to make it even better in 2017, and these will be announced throughout the Spring, to help make sure visitors have a range of things to do and see, in addition to the wide range of producers represented.

The Festival Board has been working hard to retain previous sponsors and attract new companies to the Festival. These will be given the opportunity to have a presence on the web site and in the marketing material issued for the day.

Social media will again be a major channel for ensuring information is distributed to people interested in the Festival. There is less emphasis on demonstrations and more on tastings, because this proved popular last year.

There is no need to increase the numbers attending much beyond what has been achieved in recent years, because it is already extremely popular and the town has a natural capacity to be able to stage the event.

4 TOURISM ACTIVITIES

4.1 Visitor Guide and Website Refresh

The new 2017 Discover Ribble Valley Visitor was launched at an event to celebrate English Tourism week. The event also marked the launch of a new Ribble Valley Food

website www.ribblevalleyfoodheaven.com, which promotes local food outlets, suppliers and providers, to visitors and local people. The website features guide advertisers, with an allocation of space which relates to advertising purchased in the printed publication. This new site is designed to provide a one-stop-shop for places to eat in Ribble Valley, as well as places to purchase locally grown or sourced food and drink. The site will also feature food offers, menus and more detailed information on chefs and events. The launch involved food producers with a mini local market place, where guests from local tourism businesses were able to taste and sample locally produced food and drink. The event was designed to encourage local businesses to use local suppliers, as well as promote local food to their visitors.

The event also marked the relaunch of the popular Visit Ribble Valley website, the primary tourism website for the area. www.visitribblevalley.co.uk has been restructured and redesigned to make it more user-friendly. Again, advertisers in the guide will now get priority exposure on the website. For example, if you are looking for accommodation, a search for somewhere to stay on the website will automatically offer guide advertisers first. This added value will help promote sales income for 2018. This new approach not only responds to the growing demand for electronic information but also provides a better deal for guide advertisers. Furthermore, it gives the Council a justification for the way in which tourism information is presented electronically

The printed guide has a 25,000 print run, part of which is distributed through a national service, with a policy of minimal wastage, i.e. guides are supplied to outlets such as tourist information and visitor centres on demand, rather than ad-hoc or in bulk. The guide is also distributed locally and most local accommodation providers use it as a bedroom browser. Work will now begin on the 2018 edition, with a particular aim to enhance the photographic library for promotional use.

4.2 Group Travel

In partnership with the Ribble Valley Tourism Association, the services of leading consultant Steve Reed Tourism have been employed to deliver a workshop to develop a strategy for group travel into the area. It was attended by some of Ribble Valley's leading tourism businesses, including attractions and accommodation providers. It also attracted representatives from tour guiding and coach operations. Steve Reed Tourism is one of the major consultancies specializing in group travel in England, and the workshop discussed ways to attract more, and better quality, groups. A working group, coordinated by the Council's Tourism Officer, has been created to take this initiative forward.

4.3 Ribble Valley Tourism Awards

The Ribble Valley Tourism awards are an opportunity to celebrate the success of local tourism enterprises such as restaurants, hotels and attractions. They also provide the opportunity to reward the special efforts of individuals in making visitors and guests welcome into the area. The awards are run jointly by the Ribble Valley Tourism Association supported the Council. They are unique in that anyone may make nominations, and this year businesses nominated themselves, their staff, and indeed, each other. The public were also invited to make nominations via social media, as the RVTA searched for the 'Stars of Tourism' of the past twelve months. An independent panel considered a large number of submissions, and selected those who they believed to be the most deserving winners.

The awards are not necessarily designed to determine the 'best of' but more to recognize achievement, innovation, quality design, creativity and, most of all, people. They consider people both as individuals and as teams, as it is the people that work so hard to make visitors welcome and make tourism in the Ribble Valley so special.

Categories	Star Award
Transformational Tourism	Holmes Mill
Creative Tourism	Latitude
Family Friendly Tourism	Mrs Dowson's Farm Park
Creative Marketing	John Flanagan, Jazz and Blues
Quality Tourism	Millstone Mellor
Creativity in Food and Hospitality	Gibbon Bridge Hotel
Team Excellence in customer service	Aspinall Arms
Team Excellence and innovation	Spread Eagle Sawley
Team Spirit	Dream Weddings, James Places
New Event of the Year	Create Longridge
Event of the Year	Ribfest music festival
Website of the year	Browsholme Hall
Unsung Heroes	David Bamber, Stanley House
	Robert Lowe, Gibbon Bridge
	David Piff, Mitton Hall
	Nick Bristow, Eaves Hall
Excellence in customer service	Catherine Turner, Browsholme
	Nina Rubin, Mitton Hall
Tourism Heroes	Mike and Paula Fairburn, Bowland Cottage

4.4 External Educational Liaison

In support of helping young people development their skills, the Tourism and Events Officer continues to work closely with educational establishments, taking student placements and working with universities requiring consultancy style projects. This not only offers students 'real life' work experience, but provides valuable research data for the Council's tourism product development. Recently, a consultancy project by a student from the University of Central Lancashire has helped develop a new strategy on the promotion of events using social media, whilst a team from Leeds Beckett University has evaluated the impact, value and potential of wedding tourism. Regular work experience participants also help with tourism promotions at different times of the year, and this year, one 3-month marketing placement has been hosted from the International Business Academy in Denmark. All student placements provide valuable support for tourism development but moreover, bring new and fresh ideas.

5 CONCLUSION

Further relevant information regarding these and other activities and developments will be brought to future meetings.

MARK BEVERIDGE

HEAD OF CULTURAL AND LEISURE SERVICES

TOM PRIDMORE

TOURISM AND EVENTS OFFICER

JOHN HEAP

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

For further information on the Cycle Race, and the Food Festival please contact Mark Beveridge 01200 414479

For further information on Tourism Activities please contact Tom Pridmore 01200 414496